

PATENT

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Final Office Action dated May 5, 2005. Claims 1-30 were examined. Claims 1, 7, 8, 11, 14, 16, 18, 25-27, 29, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,550,815 to Cloonan et al. Claims 2, 3, 6, 9, 10, 15, 17, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cloonan in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,115,373 to Lea. Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cloonan in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,821,875 to Lee et al. Claims 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cloonan and Lea. Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cloonan. Claims 13, 21, 22, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cloonan in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,676,846 to Busch. Claim 20 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Claims 1, 7, 8, 11, 14, 16, 18, 25-27, 29, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,550,815 to Cloonan et al. Claim 1 is amended to include limitations of claim 13, which Applicants believe is allowable over the art of record.

Amended claim 1 recites

the sending node writing a packet to a send register,  
the sending node polling a status register to  
determine if transmission of the packet was  
successful, and if transmission was unsuccessful  
rewriting the packet to the send register.

Applicants respectfully maintain that Cloonan, alone or in combination with other references of record fails to teach or suggest polling a status register to determine if transmission of a packet was successful. The Office Action relies on col. 9, lines 7-34 and col. 8, lines 53-57 of Busch to supply this teaching. These portions of Busch teach an interrupt driven peripheral computer 119 (col. 8, line 65-col. 9, line 13). Only upon receiving an interrupt does peripheral computer 119 of Busch check a status of input/output devices (col. 8, line 73-col. 9, line 20). The status checking of input/output devices upon receiving an interrupt of Busch fails to teach or suggest polling a status register, to determine if transmission of a packet was successful as required by

PATENT

amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 and all claims dependent thereon, be withdrawn.

Applicants appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter in claim 20. Claim 18 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 19 and 20. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 18 and all claims dependent thereon, be withdrawn.

Claims 13-17, 19, 20, and 30 are cancelled.

In summary, claims 1-12, 18, and 21-29 are in the case. All claims are believed to be allowable over the art of record, and a Notice of Allowance to that effect is respectfully solicited. Nonetheless, if any issues remain that could be more efficiently handled by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the number listed below.

<b><u>CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION</u></b>	
I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being	
<input type="checkbox"/> deposited with the US Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail and addressed as shown above.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> facsimile transmitted to the US Patent and Trademark Office.	
	<u>7/5/05</u>
Nicole Teitler Cave	Date
EXPRESS MAIL LABEL: _____	

Respectfully submitted,



Nicole Teitler Cave, Reg. No. 54,021  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
(512) 338-6315  
(512) 338-6301 (fax)